

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed on 11/10/2009. Claims 26-30 are allowed. Claim 38 is objected to. Claims 1-14, 16, 36, and 37 are rejected. In this Amendment, claims 1 and 13 have been amended. No new matter has been added. No claims have been canceled. Therefore, claims 1-14, 16, 26-30, and 36-38 are presented for examination.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-14, 16, and 36-37

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-14, 16, and 36-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly rendered obvious by Bindra, "Programmable SOC Delivers a New Level of System Flexibility", 2000, in view of Hamblen, "Rapid Prototyping Using Field Programmable Logic Devices, 6-2000."

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. A method for configuring a microcontroller, comprising:
 - displaying a first graphical user interface on a display device of a computer system, said first graphical user interface comprising a collection of virtual blocks in a design system;
 - receiving at said computer system a selection of a user module, wherein said user module comprises information for implementing a function using a programmable physical block;
 - displaying on said display device a second graphical user interface operable for receiving user-specifiable information about said user module;
 - assigning a virtual block taken from said collection to said user module, wherein said virtual block corresponds to said programmable physical block; and
 - constructing computer-generated source code, wherein constructing the computer-generated source code comprises

automatically constructing assembly code holding configuration information for said programmable physical block, wherein said configuration information is based on said user-specifiable information and *comprises information that is loaded into a register of said programmable physical block to cause said programmable physical block to perform said function.* (Emphasis added.)

Regarding claim 1, the Office Action states:

Bindra does not specific mention the source code is loaded into a register of said programmable physical block.

However, it should be noted that every source code that implement a virtual block is an executable code such as assembly language. There is no thing new for this.

The Office Action admits that Bindra does not teach or suggest “information that is loaded into a register of said programmable physical block”, as claimed. Furthermore, the Office Action fails to establish that “information that is loaded into a register of said programmable physical block” is obvious in view of Bindra. With regard to the above cited argument from the Office Action, whether or not “every source code that implement a virtual block is an executable code such as assembly language” does not determine whether or not such code is loaded into a register of a programmable physical block.

Furthermore, although the Office Action appears to argue that loading *assembly code* into a register is allegedly obvious in view of Bindra, claim 1 instead recites that the user-specifiable information includes “*information* that is loaded into a register of said programmable physical block” (Emphasis added). The Office Action therefore fails to establish that Bindra teaches or suggests “automatically constructing assembly code holding configuration information for said programmable physical block, wherein said configuration information is based on said user-specifiable information and comprises information that is

loaded into a register of said programmable physical block to cause said programmable physical block to perform said function”, as claimed.

The Office Action appears to consider the assembly language generated by the retargetable C compiler, as illustrated in Figure 11 of Hamblen, as reading on “automatically constructing assembly code”. However, even assuming *arguendo* that this is true, Hamblen still does not teach or suggest that the assembly code generated by the retargetable C compiler *holds configuration information that comprises information that is loaded into a register of said programmable physical block* to cause said programmable physical block to perform a function. Therefore, Hamblen further does not teach or suggest automatically constructing assembly code holding configuration information for said programmable physical block, wherein said configuration information is based on said user-specifiable information and *comprises information that is loaded into a register of said programmable physical block* to cause said programmable physical block to perform said function, as claimed.

Because neither Bindra nor Hamblen teaches or suggests this feature of claim 1, as amended, the combination of Bindra and Hamblen cannot be properly interpreted as disclosing the claimed feature. Claim 1 is therefore not rendered obvious by the combination of Bindra and Hamblen. Claim 13, as amended, includes similar features as claim 1 and is therefore also not rendered obvious by the combination. Claims 2-12, 14, 16, and 36-37 depend from one of claims 1 and 13 and are also not rendered obvious by the combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-14, 16, and 36-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly rendered obvious by the combination of Bindra and Hamblen.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 26-27 are allowable and that claim 38 contains allowable subject matter if rewritten to include all the elements of the claims from which it originally depends. In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 38 now depends from an allowable base claim. Applicant further submits that the claims are now in condition for allowance, and requests allowance of said claims.

Conclusion

Claims 1-14, 16, 36, and 37 are currently pending. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this response or the application in general, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicant's attorney, Kerry Liang, by telephone at (408) 545-7399. All correspondence should continue to be directed to the address given below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17, 1.18, 1.20 and 1.21 that may be required to maintain pendency of the present application, and to credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. 50-3781.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 2/10/2010

/Kerry Liang/

Kerry Liang
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 60,519

Cypress Semiconductor Corporation
198 Champion Court
San Jose, CA 95134
Facsimile: (408) 545-6911
Customer No.: 60909